[President]

the efforts of the Select Committee on this Bill, ask the Select Committee to ponder carefully over the possibilities of extending the scope of the Bill to agricultural labour which necessarily has to be governed by specific conditions which do not appertain to or are appropriate to industrial labour.

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI: I may also point out to this honourable House the definition of trade under clause (e) which says: "plantation or any other business which Government may, from time to time, by notification declare" etc., etc.

Having explained this, I may also state that with regard to the constitution of the Committee, the Government are of the opinion that for the time being it must be presided over by an officer of Government and that the members be nominated. The whole thing may, of course, change later on, when the scheme develops.

The motion that the Bill be read in the Assembly was put and carried.

SECRETARY: The title of the Bill shall be "The Travancore Trade Boards Bill."

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI: I move that the Bill be committed to a Select Committee consisting of the following members:—

1. *Rajyasevanirata* S. Ghattanatha Karayalar
2. Mr. V. K. Velayudhan.
3. „ V. Gangadharan Nair
4. „ Xavier Vincent
5. „ P. K. Kunju
6. „ P. N. Krishna Pillai
7. „ M. L. Janardana Pillai
8. „ K. C. Karunakaran
9. „ J. E. A. Pereira
10. „ A. R. Sulaiman Sait
11. „ J. W. Tolson
12. „ K. A. Mathew
13. „ V. S. Krishna Pillai
14. „ P. Udayabhanu

The motion was put and carried.

THE TRAVANCORE CHITTIES BILL.

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI: Sir, I rise to introduce the Travancore Chitties Bill and move that the Bill be read in the House.

MR. S. NARAYANA AIYAR: I second it.

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI: The Statement of Objects and Reasons gives in detail the object of the Bill. The Bill is intended to be a consolidating Act and to take the place of the existing Act.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: In rising to support the principle of the Chitties Bill I wish to make a few observations. Before coming to the consideration of the principles, I wish to know

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

from the Government why they did not think it worth while to furnish copies of the report of the Chitties Committee constituted by the Government. They did not furnish the members of the Legislature with a report of the Committee.

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI: That is a document which is in our hands. Nobody has asked for it. It embodies the main recommendations of the Committee.

PRESIDENT: When did it come to our hands?

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI: Sometime back. I did not know it was necessary to furnish every honourable member with a copy.

PRESIDENT: There can be no objection to its being placed in the hands of every honourable member. I shall give directions accordingly.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: Thank you, Sir. The practice was to make the report available to the members of the Legislature so that they may be enabled to study the pros and cons of the matter.

PRESIDENT: So far as I can see, the provisions of the Chitties Bill are mainly what may be called the adaptations of the Chitties Committee's resolutions. I am told that practically it is an adaptation, *in extenso*, of the Chitty Committee's recommendations.

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI: I have stated so in the Statement of Objects and Reasons, Sir.

PRESIDENT: That being so, and as there are no departures in principle from the points made by the Chitty Committee, the question may be considered whether it will not be convenient to refer the Bill to a Select Committee who will have full opportunities of reading it. All the honourable members also will have a copy of the Report by that time, and the Bill may be considered after that.

I take it that this reference of the Bill to a Select Committee will be finished in about half an hour. I do not think that it will take much longer. Is it the wish of the honourable House that as soon as the legislative work is over, the elections may proceed? I think there are four elections to be conducted.

(The House expressed its assent).

PRESIDENT: Yes; the House will now adjourn and meet again at three o'clock.

The House reassembled at 3 P. M. the Dewan-President presiding.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: Sir, the first Chitties Act III of 1097 was amended three times before. But such amendments were not sufficient to bring about the desired effect. It is really satisfying to note that the present Bill contains several important provisions to safeguard the interests, both of the foremen and the subscribers as a whole and the unprized and unpaid subscribers in particular. Clause 13 of the Bill clearly restricts the extent to which

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. Puliyoor T. P. Velayudhan Pillai]

alone the alteration of Variola can be effected by means of Special Resolutions and in the existing law there is no such provision. Hitherto the foremen could start and conduct chitties without executing security bonds, if that course was assented to by all the subscribers. Even in cases where the foremen executed security bonds, it has been a matter of common knowledge that the properties charged were ultimately found to be valueless or thoroughly inadequate for the realisation of the amounts charged on such properties. The whole difficulty was that there was no officer to scrutinise the real nature and the value of the properties charged. But irrespective of the consent of all the subscribers of the chitty, clause 17 of the Bill makes it incumbent on the foreman to execute security bond charging properties sufficient to the satisfaction of the Registrar or any officer empowered by Government in that behalf. Sir, under the existing law the foreman could take any amount as commission or remuneration out of the chitty amount for the conduct of the chitty. But Clause 18 sub-clause (1) (b) provides that such commission or remuneration should not exceed five per cent. of the chitty amount.

According to the existing law there is no punishment prescribed for default in the investment by the foreman of the unpaid prize amount in any approved bank or for the withdrawal of the same for purposes other than those for which these amounts have been held in deposit. But Clause 19 sub-clause (4) provides for punishment for such non-investment or withdrawal. In the majority of cases, chitties collapsed as a result of the misappropriation by the foremen of consolidated payments of future subscribers made by defaulting prized subscribers. Similarly instances were also numerous where the foremen used to execute assignments of chitty bonds in favour of their near relations without any consideration or *bona fides*, with a view to defraud creditors. Sir, it is gratifying to note that the new Bill contains adequate provision for the prevention of such misappropriations and fraudulent transfers. The provision regarding the preparation of an annual balance sheet containing the assets and the liabilities of the chitty and also the provision that all payments in respect of the chitty either by the foremen or by the subscribers, should be evidenced by documents, will no doubt minimise the unnecessary contentions in chitty suits. So my submission is that the new provisions contained in the Bill will conduce to better and more satisfactory conduct of the chitties in future. With these observations, I support the general principle of the Travancore Chitties Bill.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: Sir, there can be little doubt that the provisions of the present Chitties Act require to be amended. As I understand, from the chitty transactions in the State, the following things result. An astute chitty foreman colludes with certain subscribers and tries to defeat a major portion of the innocent subscribers. This is what actually happens in the real working of the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Chitty Rules. Therefore it is necessary to introduce legislation to prevent an astute foreman from defeating the subscribers in general. Sir, in the proposed Bill, one looks in vain to find out an effective provision to meet such an evil. I think I can substantiate that point. After all, the chitty foreman is defeating the subscribers by keeping incorrect and unsafe records. I find that the provisions of the old Act have been copied out here. As such, nothing new is put in the proposed Bill to prevent the evil suggested. Let us see for a moment what the provisions are in the old Act for this purpose. Certain account books such as day book and ledger have to be preserved. They are important records to be maintained. Under the proposed Bill, there is no need to maintain them. I do not know why such a salient point was missed by the draftsman of the Act. No doubt, there is no similar legislation in British India which puts us in a serious handicap.

PRESIDENT: The honourable member would do well to refer to sub-clause (4) of clause 20.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: Clause 20 says—

"The foreman shall keep—

Books to be kept by the foreman.

(1) a register containing—

(*a*) the names and full addresses of the subscribers together with the number of shares held by each subscriber;

(*b*) the dates on which the subscribers signed the variola; and

(*c*) in case of assignment by a subscriber the name and full address of the assignee with the date of assignment and the date on which the assignment has been recognised by the foreman;

(2) a book containing the minute of the proceedings mentioned in Section 15;

(3) a book containing—

(*a*) the amount paid by the subscribers and the date of such payments;

(*b*) the amount paid to the prized subscribers with the date of such payments;

(*c*) in case of deposit in Bank, the date and amount of such deposit;

(4) such other books including a day book as may be prescribed from time to time by Our Government."

Sir, I ask, in what way is this different from the old law.

PRESIDENT: But there is nothing to prevent the Select Committee from enacting suitable modifications to the proposed Bill.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: Again, there was an Amendment Act empowering a chitty foreman not to postpone the chitty beyond one year. In the proposed Act, there is a provision for postponing the date of the chitties. But I do not know why the framers of the Act forgot the provisions of the Amending Act in this behalf.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: Sir, may I bring to the notice of the House that that provision was intended only for a temporary period of one year due to the prevalence of the then economic depression.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: It only accords with justice and practical common sense that it is not safe that chitties must be postponed from year after year. If the provisions of the Amendment Act were copied out in the proposed Bill, that would have given a stability to the proposed measure and the chitty foreman will not be in a position to play fraud on the subscribers.

Then, Sir, the proposed Section 33 is practically a word for word copy of Section 28 of the old Act. There are conflicting decisions of the High Court on that matter. The present position seems to be this. In order that the Section must operate, the foreman must be in absolutely insolvent circumstances according to one set of decisions. Another set of decisions says just the opposite. One looks in vain in order to clarify that point in the proposed Bill.

Again, it is stated that the provisions of the proposed Bill would conduce to prevent the foreman from defeating the subscribers. A foreman has to give certain securities. He has to deposit the amount collected from subscribers in an approved bank and could draw the money back only for the purpose of paying the prized subscribers. All this is made to obviate the evils arising out of irregularities by foremen. I for my part fail to see the difference between the provisions of the proposed and the old enactment. The foreman has only to state that he is drawing the money for payment to prized subscribers. He need not pay it to the subscribers.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: Then, is there not a penal provision made to deal with the misuse of money?

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: Even in the old Act there are provisions to this effect. But my point is—

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: According to the member may I know, what more can be provided by the legislature?

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: Why cannot provisions be made to enable monies to be paid to the prized subscriber? Why should it be, that money has to be drawn from the bank and then paid? These are some of the glaring defects which have to be looked into. I do not fail to see any marked difference between the present Act and proposed Bill in this matter. If I am to discuss the various provisions of the Bill, that will take up the time of the House unduly long. In as much as the Bill may come up at the Select Committee, I am satisfied by pointing out that the present provisions are quite unsatisfactory. There has been an insufficient appreciation of the difficulties of the litigant public and the actual subscribers. Hence I cannot support the present Bill for the reasons given in the Bill as such.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: Will the member enlighten us on some of the practical difficulties noticed in the actual working of the Act?

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: If the President gives time, I shall try to explain that.

PRESIDENT: Mr. Narayana Pillai will do well to say that.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: There must be effective provisions to see that foremen do not defeat subscribers. The defeat is caused in two ways. Either he takes the money himself or misappropriates it in certain forms. He colludes with some subscribers to defeat subscribers to whom money has to be disbursed. Provisions should be made by which foremen are not able to do mischief.

Now, there must be effective provisions by which the foremen are prevented from committing fraud. Under the provisions of the old Act, the foreman shall disburse the amount of the chitty only on security being furnished, and if securities are not furnished, the foreman shall deposit the money in some banks. In what way are the provisions of the Bill different from the provisions in the old Act? That is my question.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: Is there any provision in the existing Act whereby the foreman is compelled to pay the amount only on taking proper security, by way of hypothecation or otherwise?

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: There is no such provision in the existing Act. Nevertheless, invariably it is provided in the chitty variola, that such security shall be taken, so much so, that as a matter of practical working, there is no difficulty by reason of the provisions of the Act. My point has entirely been misunderstood by my honourable friend. My point is this. The present provision that the money shall be deposited in the bank or banks as the case may be, is not a salutary provision, for, the foreman has only to make a statement before the bank that he is drawing the money for the purpose of disbursing to the subscriber. In order to prevent that, there is only what is called, the penal provision. There must be some other effective method by which the foreman shall not draw the money except for the purpose of disbursement to the prized subscriber. If the course that I suggest is adopted, this difficulty can be obviated. Let the money go into a bank. Let the subscriber produce the appropriate security, and then draw the money direct from the bank. If that is done, there will be an effective check. I believe my friend is grasping the point.

MR. JOSEPH VITHAYATHIL (*Co-opted*): Sir, I did not think that it would be necessary for me to speak on the general principles of the Bill as I thought that the amendments proposed in the Bill to the existing Chitty Act for the purpose of safeguarding the interests of the subscribers would be welcomed by the House. But my friend Mr. T. K. Narayana Pillai has thought fit to raise certain objections to the Bill and I think it necessary to meet them. According to him the present Bill is not sufficient to safeguard the interests of the subscribers. He says that the objec

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. Joseph Vithayathil]

of the Bill must be primarily to prevent foremen from committing fraud upon subscribers. As one who has taken some part in the preparation of the report of the committee appointed by Government for the purpose of considering the question of amending the law relating to chitties, I may say that the principal object of this Amending Bill is nothing but safeguarding the interests of the subscribers and preventing foremen from committing fraud on them. I may even say that that is the only object of the Bill. I shall refer to the particular points raised by my friend. The first is that there is no provision requiring the foreman to keep the necessary books of accounts particularly a day book. But clause 20 has been so drafted as to make it compulsory on the part of the foremen to keep all the necessary books, including a day book about which particular reference was made by my friend. Although chitties are not conducted every day, some chitties being conducted once in six months or even once in a year, it was thought necessary to insist on the foreman keeping even a day book, if so prescribed by Government. My friend said that there is nothing in the Bill for enforcing this provision. But clause 21 penalises the default in the matter of keeping such books. That clause reads thus:—"Any foreman who defaults to keep the books as required by Section 20 shall be liable to a fine not exceeding fifty rupees." Therefore it is not correct to say that there is no provision in the Bill to enforce the obligation created by clause 20.

Then my friend said that in drafting the Bill the provisions of the Chitty Amendment Act under which chitties can be adjourned for not more than a year were not taken notice of. He says that a similar provision ought to have been inserted in this Bill and that the omission is a serious defect. This question was considered by the Committee, but it was thought that in the light of the provision relating to the alteration of variola it was meaningless to embody the provisions of the Amendment Act relating to the postponement of the chitty. Under clause 13 the provisions of the variola can be altered by a special resolution in respect of certain specified matters including the suspension or prolongation of the chitty. If that is so, what is the meaning or significance in having a special clause which enables the foreman and subscribers to agree to an adjournment of the chitty for not more than a year? Clause 13 allows the foreman and subscribers to amend the variola in respect of certain matters *i. e.* reducing the capital of the chitty, advancing the chitty or postponing the chitty, etc. When there is such a general provision like that, what is the meaning in having a special clause allowing the foreman and subscribers to postpone the chitty for not more than a year? It would be meaningless and I can only say that this anomaly was not brought to the notice of the Legislature when the Amendment Act was passed. That Act was unnecessary in the light of the provision relating to alteration of variola contained in the old Act.

MR. C. K. SANKARA PILLAI: Is the member aware that in certain cases the foreman postpones, by means of a resolution, the chitty for one year, by another resolution, to another year, and so on?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. JOSEPH VITHAYATHIL: I am aware of that. We thought that the Amendment Act was capable of different interpretations and that it would give rise to many difficulties. Therefore we thought that it was not necessary to insert that clause in the Bill. We also thought it necessary to restrict the powers of the foreman in the matter of altering the provisions of the variola. In the case of certain specific matters only variola can be amended and one of such matters is the suspension or prolongation of the chitty (clause 13.) In effect, the provisions of the Amending Act have been inserted in the new Bill and I should think that it was a case of mere oversight on the part of my friend in not adverting to that.

Then my friend said that in the case of clause 33 there is no difference between the Bill and the existing Act. There need not be a difference for the sake of a mere difference. Simply because we are introducing a new legislation it is not necessary that all the provisions of the existing Act should be amended. But there is a material change even in so far as Section 33 is concerned, because under the existing Act the rights of the foreman can be transferred provided such transfer will not have the effect of defrauding or delaying the subscribers.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: May I know from the honourable member, whether Section 33 (1) is not a new provision?

MR. JOSEPH VITHAYATHIL: That is exactly what I was saying. As a matter of fact, under the existing Act the chitty rights can be transferred by the foreman provided the transfer does not affect the subscribers. We were of opinion that this right is being very often misused by the foreman and therefore we have taken away that right from him. If my honourable friend had only taken care to read the Bill carefully, this material change would have been noticed by him. Clause 33 provides for an absolute prohibition of the transfer of chitty rights without the previous sanction in writing of Registrar.

MR. T. K. NARAYANA PILLAI: What provision has been made to solve the conflict of decisions in respect of the matter that foreman must be in solvent circumstances, in order that the provisions shall apply? That was what the High Court held once.

MR. JOSEPH VITHAYATHIL: This new clause makes the position absolutely clear. It is on account of the words "if it defeats or delays a non-prized or un-prized subscriber" occurring in Section 28 of the existing Act that the High Court had to interpret that section in that manner and to hold that transfer of chitty rights by foremen will be invalid only if it defeats or delays the subscribers and that if the foreman is in solvent circumstances at the time of the transfer, the transfer will be valid. It is purposely to avoid the difficulties that often arise on account of this interpretation of Section 28 that we thought it necessary to amend the section by taking away the clause referred to above. It is a very material change that has been introduced in the Bill.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: Was not a transfer under Section 28 only a voidable transfer?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. JOSEPH VITHAYATHIL: Yes, Sir. It is so. That matter also was considered by the committee and the new clause was drafted on the basis of the experience gained by the committee as a result of the decisions of the High Court referred to by Mr. T. K. Narayana Pillai.

Then Sir, my friend stated that there is no difference between the existing Act and the Bill with regard to the provisions meant for safeguarding the interest of the subscribers. I must say that my friend is absolutely mistaken. Numerous new provisions have been inserted in the Bill for achieving this object. Under the existing Act conducting an unregistered chitty which ought to be registered is not an offence. The Act only prohibits the conduct of such chitties, but does not make it an offence. In the Bill it is made an offence to conduct such chitties. Again one means of defrauding the subscribers usually resorted to by foremen is to provide in the variola that, in the peculiar circumstances of the case, it is not necessary that the foreman should furnish security for the proper conduct of the chitty. We have taken away that freedom of contract and have made it obligatory on the part of the foreman to furnish security in all cases. With regard to the security also, we thought that it should not be a matter which should be left to the discretion of the foreman and the subscribers as is the case under the existing Act. The Bill provides that in the case of property security it should have the approval of the Chitty Registrar or any other officer appointed by Government in that behalf. Otherwise, there must be cash security. What more provision should be inserted in the Bill with regard to security?

With regard to the deposit of the chitty amounts which a foreman is bound to deposit under the provisions of the existing Act there is no provision in the Act to enforce this obligation. Therefore a penal provision is inserted in the Bill for enforcing this obligation. Mr. Narayana Pillai said that there is nothing in the Bill to prevent the foreman from withdrawing the amount deposited by him and using the same for purposes of his own. But in clause 19 (4) we have provided that withdrawal of such amounts for purposes other than for which they have been deposited will be an offence for which the foreman can be punished. Then again with regard to the taking of the security by foreman from prized subscribers the provisions of the existing Act have been found to be entirely inadequate. Under the existing Act there is nothing to prevent the foreman from taking any security and thereby defrauding the non-prized subscribers. We have provided in the Bill that failure to take proper security and fraud or collusion practised by the foreman in that respect will be one of the reasons for which a chitty can be wound up. We have also given the non-prized subscribers the right to inspect the security bonds and to satisfy themselves that they are sufficient to safeguard their interests. Again, if a foreman purchases the property offered as security in court auction, the Bill says that it will remain as security for the amounts due to the other subscribers. The foreman can only hold it in trust for the subscribers. He cannot deal with it as he likes as he can do under the existing Act.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Future subscriptions realised in a lump have also to be deposited by the foreman, as also amounts to be paid to defaulter subscribers on the termination of the chitty. It is also provided that the foreman cannot claim as his commission more than 5 per cent of the chitty amount. In fact the position of the foreman has been reduced to that of a mere trustee who is paid a commission for the work he does on behalf of the subscribers. His freedom of contract is very much curtailed by the Bill.

MR. A. NESAMONY (*Kalkulam* cum *Vilavancode*): If he is reduced to the position of a trustee, will a suit against him be barred by limitation?

MR. JOSEPH VITHAYATHIL: According to this Bill if a winding up petition is filed a suit will not be necessary and the question of limitation will not arise. At present if a chitty collapses it is practically impossible for the subscribers to get anything out of the chitty assets. Numerous suits will have to be filed with numerous parties. Now the whole thing can be settled by means of a petition as in the case of a company.

MR. C. K. SANKARA PILLAI: With regard to the right of amendment of variola, can the honourable member say whether there is a condition for the right of amendment?

MR. JOSEPH VITHAYATHIL: We have provided that the variola can be amended only in respect of certain matters. Formerly it could be altered in any respect. Now it is provided that it can be altered only in respect of four specified matters.

MR. C. K. SANKARA PILLAI: May I ask the honourable member whether the alteration of the variola is not often done behind the subscribers?

MR. JOSEPH VITHAYATHIL: Very often it is so. That is exactly the reason why we have provided that the variola can be altered only in respect of certain matters. We have also thought it necessary to amend the definition of "special resolution" with this object in view.

MR. M. K. NILAKANTAN (*Mavelikkara* cum *Kunnattur*): പണം കൊടുക്കേണ്ട സമയത്തു പണം മുഴുവനും പിരിഞ്ഞു കിട്ടാതെയിരിക്കുന്നതു സാധാരണയാണോ? പണം കൊടുക്കേണ്ട സമയത്തു തലയാളന്മാർ പണം മുഴുവൻ കെട്ടിവയ്ക്കണമെന്നില്ലേ? അതിലേക്കുവേണ്ടി ചിട്ടി സ്വത്തുക്കൾ അന്യാധീനപ്പെടുത്താൻ അനുവദിക്കേണ്ടേ?

MR. JOSEPH VITHAYATHIL: പുതിയ ബില്ലിൽ അതിനുവേണ്ട വ്യവസ്ഥകൾ ചെയ്തിട്ടുണ്ട്. ചിട്ടി രജിസ്ട്രാരുടെ അനുവാദത്തോടുകൂടി അത്യാവശ്യ സന്ദർഭങ്ങളിൽ ചെയ്യാവുന്നതാണ്. എന്നാൽ മുനാളന്മാർക്കു ചിട്ടിസ്വത്തുക്കൾ അന്യാധീനപ്പെടുത്തുന്നതിനു അധികാരം കൊടുക്കുന്ന പക്ഷം അവർ ആ അധികാരം ദുരുപയോഗപ്പെടുത്താനാണു എളുപ്പം. അതുകൊണ്ടാണു ബില്ലിൽ ഭേദഗതി വരുത്തിയിരിക്കുന്നതു.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. P. O. THOMAS (*Kunnatunad* cum *Parur*): Is not the section which penalises a subscriber joining a void chitty a very hard provision?

MR. JOSEPH VITHAYATHIL: Such transactions are more or less of the nature of lotteries which may not strictly come within the definition of lottery under the Penal Code. There is nothing wrong in punishing all persons who co-operate in any manner in the conduct of such transactions.

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI: Sir, so far as the details on which questions have been raised in this House are concerned, my honourable friend Mr. Joseph Vithayathil has explained the position, and I have nothing to add. All that I may add is this: When the matter comes before the Select Committee, there is nothing preventing the Select Committee from modifying the details in such manner as is necessary to suit the purpose, namely to protect the interests of the subscribers. That is one point on which the House and the Government are agreed. I may also say that chitty is a peculiar growth of Malabar. Even Mr. Logan in his Manual of the Malabar District has mentioned it. It is necessary to protect it and see that it is so conducted that the interests of the people are not defeated. That is the basic principle of the Bill, on which the House and the Government are agreed. If on matters of detail any improvement is possible there is nothing preventing the Select Committee from enacting those provisions and bringing the Bill before the House.

The motion that the Bill be read in the Assembly was put and carried.

SECRETARY: The title of the Bill shall be "The Travancore Chitties Bill".

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI: I move that a Select Committee composed of the following persons be appointed to go into this Bill.

1. *Rajyasevanirata* S. Chattanatha Karayalar,
2. Mr. T. P. Velayudhan Pillai,
3. ,, A. K. Bhaskar,
4. ,, K. Balakrishna Menon,
5. ,, M. R. Ramakrishna Pillai,
6. ,, N. D. Parameswaran Nambudiri,
7. ,, T. K. Narayana Pillai,
8. ,, N. Kesava Pillai,
9. ,, K. R. Narayanan,
10. ,, C. K. Sankara Pillai,
11. ,, Joseph Vithayathil,
12. ,, M. L. Janardhana Pillai.

The motion was put and carried.

PRESIDENT: The House will now adjourn and the elections to the various committees will proceed under the presidency of the Deputy President.

The House adjourned at 3-40 P. M. to meet again the next day.

S. VAIDYANATHA AIYAR,
Secretary to the Sri Mulam Assembly.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly